

Steven P. Lehotsky\*  
Scott A. Keller\*  
Jeremy Evan Maltz\*  
Shannon G. Denmark\*  
**LEHOTSKY KELLER COHN LLP**  
200 Massachusetts Avenue, NW, Suite 700  
Washington, DC 20001  
(512) 693-8350  
steve@lkcfirm.com  
scott@lkcfirm.com  
jeremy@lkcfirm.com  
shannon@lkcfirm.com

Joshua P. Morrow\*  
**LEHOTSKY KELLER COHN LLP**  
408 W. 11th Street, 5th Floor  
Austin, TX 78701  
(512) 693-8350

josh@lkcfirm.com  
Jared B. Magnuson\*  
**LEHOTSKY KELLER COHN LLP**  
3280 Peachtree Road NE  
Atlanta, GA 30305  
(512) 693-8350  
jared@lkcfirm.com

\* Admitted *pro hac vice*.

*Attorneys for Plaintiff NetChoice*

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

NETCHOICE,

Plaintiff,

v.

ROB BONTA, in his official capacity as  
Attorney General of California,

Defendant.

Bradley A. Benbrook (SBN 177786)  
Stephen M. Duvernay (SBN 250957)  
**BENBROOK LAW GROUP, PC**  
701 University Avenue, Suite 106  
Sacramento, CA 95825  
Telephone: (916) 447-4900  
brad@benbrooklawgroup.com  
steve@benbrooklawgroup.com

Case No. 5:24-cv-07885-EJD

**PLAINTIFF'S REPLY IN SUPPORT OF  
MOTION TO STAY PROCEEDINGS  
PENDING APPEAL**

Date: March 13, 2025

Time: 9:00 am

Judge: Hon. Edward J. Davila

Courtroom: San Jose, Courtroom 4, 5th Floor

**PLAINTIFF'S REPLY IN SUPPORT OF  
MOTION TO STAY PROCEEDINGS PENDING APPEAL**

Defendant’s opposition (ECF 62) to Plaintiff NetChoice’s Motion to Stay Proceedings (ECF 59) does not offer any compelling reason why proceedings in this Court must barrel ahead while the Ninth Circuit considers the “novel, difficult, and important” “First Amendment issues raised by SB 976.” ECF 47 at 4. Just as this Court granted an injunction pending appeal “to allow the opportunity for appellate review of these weighty issues,” *id.*, it should stay this case during appellate proceedings. The Ninth Circuit will likely make precedential, binding holdings on questions of law at the core of this case, and those will define the scope of any remaining legal issues and factual disputes. It will most likely dictate what the parties will need to brief, in addition to the scope of what facts are relevant for any potential discovery. A stay of these proceedings will thus efficiently give this Court the benefit of the Ninth Circuit’s ruling while eliminating possibly wasted process in the interim that could contradict the Ninth Circuit’s ruling.

Accordingly, this Court should stay proceedings before the parties must submit their proposed case management order, on February 28, 2025.

### Argument

NetChoice has demonstrated that it satisfies any one of three sufficient criteria for a stay of proceedings: “(1) there is a ‘fair possibility’ of ‘hardship or inequity,’ (2) it would not result in ‘undue delay,’ or (3) . . . ‘it is efficient for [the court’s] docket and the fairest course for the parties to enter a stay of an action before it, pending resolution of [] proceedings which bear upon the case.” *Harville v. Three Wishes Foods, Inc.*, 2023 WL 4535476, at \*1 (N.D. Cal. July 13, 2023) (quoting *Dependable Highway Exp., Inc. v. Navigators Ins. Co.*, 498 F.3d 1059, 1066 (9th Cir. 2007)).

#### **I. A stay of proceedings would not cause “undue delay.”**

Defendant primarily argues that a stay of proceedings would result in “undue delay.” ECF 62 at 2. Yet waiting for appellate proceedings—which probably will resolve core legal issues at the heart of this lawsuit—will result in merely a stay of “short, or at least reasonable, duration.” *Dependable Highway*, 498 F.3d at 1067. As Defendant acknowledges, “the Ninth Circuit[]” is engaging in “expedited consideration of Plaintiff’s appeal.” ECF 60 at 3. NetChoice already submitted its opening brief, and the Ninth Circuit will hear oral argument on April 2, 2025. *Id.* at 1.

Accordingly, Defendant's reliance on the outlier facts in *Dependable Highway* is misplaced. That case concerned a situation where a district court stayed a case to allow for arbitration proceedings "in a foreign country when it remain[ed] unclear whether [the party opposing the stay] even agreed to arbitrate and where a foreign court has already levied legal and equitable penalties against it." *Dependable Highway*, 498 F.3d at 1066. Under those circumstances, the "indefinite stay" could cause "undue delay" because there was "no specific deadline for when the stay will terminate" and "[i]n the nearly *two years* that have passed since the [stay] order issued, [the court had] received no indication that any arbitration proceedings ha[d] commenced[,] . . . let alone concluded." *Id.* at 1066-67 (emphasis added). So the Ninth Circuit reversed that stay order because both "the stay [was] likely to do damage to [the party opposing the stay], and it is unclear when the stay might lift, if at all." *Id.* at 1067.

Here, by contrast, there are no such concerns. There is no question NetChoice has a right to an appeal. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 1292(a)(1). Nor can there be any argument that the Ninth Circuit is imposing "legal and equitable penalties against" Defendant that counsel against a stay. *Dependable Highway*, 498 F.3d at 1066. Rather, staying proceedings while the Ninth Circuit considers an expedited appeal is precisely the sort of temporary delay that is well within this Court's authority to grant.

**II. The Ninth Circuit's resolution of the appeal will provide the parties and the Court with useful guidance as to the remainder of proceedings and will promote judicial efficiency.**

Proceedings in this Court should await the Ninth Circuit's resolution of what this Court called "novel, difficult, and important" questions. ECF 47 at 4. Everything from the scope of discovery to the timing for dispositive motions may depend on what the Ninth Circuit holds—and when. So a stay of proceedings would promote judicial efficiency. *Harville*, 2023 WL 4535476, at \*1; *see* ECF 59 at 3-4.

Defendant responds that the Ninth Circuit's "disposition of appeals from *most* preliminary injunctions *may* provide little guidance as to the appropriate disposition on the merits." ECF 62 at 2 (emphases added) (quoting *California v. Azar*, 911 F.3d 558, 583 (9th Cir. 2018)). But Defendant does not explain why *this* is such a case where the appeal will provide "little guidance." To support

1 his arguments, Defendant repeatedly cites *this Court's* discussion of NetChoice's arguments and  
2 the factual inquiries they purportedly require. *E.g., id.* at 2-3.

3 But the Ninth Circuit may differ from this Court in its evaluation of NetChoice's claims  
4 and what further factual development they require, if any. The Ninth Circuit already granted  
5 NetChoice an injunction pending appeal after applying the same "standard . . . employed by district  
6 courts in deciding whether to grant a preliminary injunction." ECF 58. That standard includes an  
7 evaluation of likelihood of success on the merits. *Feldman v. Ariz. Sec'y of State*, 843 F.3d 366,  
8 367 (9th Cir. 2016). So there is substantial reason to believe that the Ninth Circuit's appellate  
9 proceedings will outline a different legal analysis for NetChoice's claims, and one that requires  
10 different factual showings. For instance, the Ninth Circuit may well disagree with this Court that  
11 "much of the First Amendment analysis depends on a close inspection of how regulated feeds  
12 actually function." ECF 39 at 22. If so, there would be no need into discovery to facilitate that  
13 "close inspection." Before discovery begins, therefore, the parties should know what legal issues  
14 remain.

15 Nevertheless, Defendant would have this Court leapfrog the Ninth Circuit entirely. That  
16 would be inefficient. The best illustration of the inefficiency is Defendant's proposal that this Court  
17 set a case management schedule that could ignore the Ninth Circuit's eventual decision entirely.  
18 ECF 61 at 3-4. For example, Defendant proposed setting the "last day to serve written discovery  
19 and deposition notices" for April 4, 2025—which is a mere two days after just the *oral argument*  
20 in the Ninth Circuit. ECF 60 at 3. That would result in inefficient discovery proceedings. There is  
21 a near-certainty that the parties will serve discovery requests that lack the Ninth Circuit's guidance  
22 about the relevant inquiries. In addition, Defendant proposed that the parties would submit their  
23 opening summary judgment motions on October 17, 2025. *Id.* at 4. But there is no guarantee that  
24 the Ninth Circuit will have issued its decision by that date, even though the Ninth Circuit has  
25 expedited the appeal. So Defendant's proposal raises a pronounced risk that the parties will need  
26 to engage in even more briefing to adapt to the Ninth Circuit's decision. And all of this discovery  
27  
28

1 and briefing may take place *before Defendant has even filed a responsive pleading*—because De-  
 2 fendant’s responsive-pleading deadline depends on resolution of the Ninth Circuit’s appeal.  
 3 ECF 59 at 3-4.

4 Defendant does not dispute that a stay could promote efficiency in another way: by giving  
 5 Defendant more time to promulgate age-assurance regulations. ECF 59 at 4 (citing ECF 18 at 7;  
 6 ECF 39 at 7). That is an added benefit that could promote efficiency, by allowing this Court to  
 7 resolve all of the issues raised by California Senate Bill 976.

8 **III. The First Amendment counsels in favor of a stay of proceedings to avoid hardship**  
 9 **to NetChoice and its members.**

10 A stay would also prevent hardship to NetChoice and its members. *Harville*, 2023 WL  
 11 4535476, at \*1; *see* ECF 59 at 3. And a stay is especially warranted in this First Amendment case.  
 12 As NetChoice has argued, the First Amendment generally requires “minimal if any discovery, to  
 13 allow parties to resolve disputes quickly without chilling speech through the threat of burdensome  
 14 litigation.” ECF 59 at 3 (quoting *FEC v. Wis. Right To Life, Inc.*, 551 U.S. 449, 469 (2007) (con-  
 15 trolling plurality op. of Roberts, C.J.)). Here, that means that the contours of the First Amendment  
 16 analysis should be resolved—and the boundaries of discovery firmly set—by the Ninth Circuit  
 17 before Defendant is permitted to seek the “‘wide-ranging’” discovery it argues this case “de-  
 18 mands.” ECF 62 at 3-4 (quoting this Court).

19 Defendant responds that the nature of the claim in *Wisconsin Right to Life* case gave rise  
 20 to minimal discovery, unlike here. ECF 62 at 4. “[T]he proper standard for an as-applied chal-  
 21 lenge to [the Bipartisan Campaign Reform Act, or BCRA] must . . . focus[] on the substance of  
 22 the communication’ at issue. . . . [I]n *Wisconsin Right to Life*, it certainly was true that ‘minimal if  
 23 any discovery’ was needed to illuminate ‘the substance of the communication’ at issue, which  
 24 consisted of three specific TV ads.” *Id.* Defendant’s response illustrates an important point: The  
 25 scope of permissible discovery in First Amendment cases must hew carefully to what facts are  
 26 “pertinent” to prevail on the First Amendment challenge. *Ams. for Prosperity Found. v. Bonta*,  
 27 594 U.S. 595, 618 (2021). Otherwise, discovery could unduly intrude into protected First Amend-  
 28

ment activity and impose an *additional* First Amendment harm. Here, NetChoice's appeal concerns precisely the question of what NetChoice must show to prevail on its First Amendment challenge.

So proceedings in this Court should await the Ninth Circuit's determination of what showing NetChoice must make.

### CONCLUSION

Accordingly, NetChoice respectfully requests this Court stay proceedings while NetChoice's appeal is pending.

DATED: February 18, 2025

Bradley A. Benbrook (SBN 177786)  
 Stephen M. Duvernay (SBN 250957)  
**BENBROOK LAW GROUP, PC**  
 701 University Avenue, Suite 106  
 Sacramento, CA 95825  
 Telephone: (916) 447-4900  
 brad@benbrooklawgroup.com  
 steve@benbrooklawgroup.com

Joshua P. Morrow\*  
**LEHOTSKY KELLER COHN LLP**  
 408 W. 11th Street, 5th Floor  
 Austin, TX 78701  
 (512) 693-8350  
 josh@lkcfirm.com

Jared B. Magnuson\*  
**LEHOTSKY KELLER COHN LLP**  
 3280 Peachtree Road NE  
 Atlanta, GA 30305  
 (512) 693-8350  
 jared@lkcfirm.com

\* Admitted *pro hac vice*.

*Attorneys for Plaintiff NetChoice*

/s/ Steven P. Lehotsky  
 Steven P. Lehotsky\*  
 Scott A. Keller\*  
 Jeremy Evan Maltz\*  
 Shannon G. Denmark\*  
**LEHOTSKY KELLER COHN LLP**  
 200 Massachusetts Avenue, NW,  
 Suite 700  
 Washington, DC 20001  
 (512) 693-8350  
 scott@lkcfirm.com  
 steve@lkcfirm.com  
 jeremy@lkcfirm.com  
 shannon@lkcfirm.com